

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 10, 2005, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Griffith et al. Applicant amends the claims to more particularly point out the present invention and distinguish it from Griffith et al. Specifically, applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 5 and claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claim 1, as now amended, requires that the impermeable barrier be bonded to the core with an adhesive. This is substantially different from Griffith et al., which teaches only that the various layers of the impermeable barrier are bonded together in order to form a flexible envelope that surrounds the core (See FIG. 3 and col. 7, lines 53-65). There is no teaching in Griffith et al. to bond the impermeable barrier to the core. Accordingly, Griffith et al. does not anticipate applicants' invention, as now claimed.

It should also be noted that Griffith et al. does not provide any teaching or suggestion to bond their impermeable barrier to the core with an adhesive. Griffith et al. teaches the formation of insulation materials that are used like fiberglass matting to insulate cavities in walls, etc. (See col. 11, lines 39 – 42). The barrier material forms an envelope that is inflated to different degrees depending upon the size of the cavity in which it is being inserted. This is substantially different from applicants' invention, which is directed to structural panels, and the like, which are relatively stiff in comparison to the flexible insulation materials taught by Griffith et al. In addition, applicants' impermeable barrier is used during the molding process and does not function as an inflatable envelope in the manner taught by Griffith et al.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tokonabe et al. As discussed above, applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 5. Claim 5 has not been rejected based on Tokonabe et al. Accordingly, the inclusion of the limitation of claim 5 into claim 1 overcomes this

rejection. In addition, claims 2, 4 and 8 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore also overcome this rejection based on Tokonabe et al.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokonabe et al in view of Brayden et al. Again, since the limitation of non-rejected claim 5 has been incorporated into claim 1, and claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, the rejection of claim 3 has been overcome.

Applicant cancels claims 9 – 27 as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reexamined and that the claims, as amended, be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2005

/David J. Oldenkamp/  
David J. Oldenkamp, Reg. #29,421  
**SHAPIRO & DUPONT LLP**  
233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700  
Santa Monica, California 90401  
(310) 319-5411 (Telephone)  
(310) 319-5401 (Facsimile)